arXiv:1609.03049v1 [math.CO] 10 Sep 2016

Key Words: excluded minors, bicircular lift matroids , graphic matroids.

THE EXCLUDED MINORS FOR THE CLASS OF MATROIDS THAT ARE GRAPHIC OR BICIRCULAR LIFT

RONG CHEN

ABSTRACT. Bicircular lift matroids are a class of matroids defined on the edge set of a graph. For a given graph G, the circuits of its bicircular lift matroid $L(G)$ are the edge sets of those subgraphs of G that contain at least two cycles, and are minimal with respect to this property. For each cycle C of G, since $L(G)/C$ is graphic and most graphic matroids are not bicircular lift, the class of bicircular lift matroids is not minor-closed. In this paper, we prove that the class of matroids that are graphic or bicircular lift has a finite list of excluded minors.

1. INTRODUCTION

We assume that the reader is familiar with fundamental definitions in matroid and graph theory. All definitions in matroid theory that are used but not defined in the paper follow from Oxley's book [3]. For a graph G, a set $X \subseteq E(G)$ is a *cycle* if $G|X$ is a connected 2-regular graph. bicircular lift matroids are a class of matroids defined on the edge set of a graph. For a given graph G, the circuits of its bicircular lift matroid $L(G)$ are the edge sets of those subgraphs of G that contain at least two cycles, and are minimal with respect to this property. That is, the circuits of $L(G)$ consists of the edge sets of two edge-disjoint cycles with at most one common vertex, or three internally disjoint paths between a pair of distinct vertices.

Bicircular lift matroids are a special class of lift matroids that arises from biased graphs, where biased graphs and its lift matroids were introduced by Zaslavsky in [8, 9]. Let BL denote the class of bicircular lift matroids . For each cycle C of G, since $L(G)/C$ is graphic and most graphic matroids are not in BL by the following Lemma 4.4, this class BL is not minor-closed. But the union of BL and the class of graphic matroids is a minor-closed class. Let $\overline{BL}$ denote this class. Irene Pivotto [4] conjectured

Conjecture 1.1. *The class $\overline{BL}$ has a finite list of excluded minors.*

In this paper, we prove that the conjecture is true. In fact, we prove a stronger result.

Theorem 1.2. *Let M be an excluded minor of $\overline{BL}$. Then*

- *either M is a direct sum of the uniform matroid $U_{2,4}$ and a loop, or*
- *M is 3-connected with $r(M) \leq 11$ and with $|E(M)| \leq 224$.*

In the rest of paper, we always let M be an excluded minor of $\overline{BL}$. The paper is organized as follows. Some related definitions and basic results are given in Section 2. In Section 3, we prove that when M is not connected, M is a direct sum of the uniform matroid $U_{2,4}$ and a loop. In Section 4, we prove that if M is connected then M is 3-connected. In Section 5, we prove that if M is 3-connected then $r(M) \leq 11$ and $|E(M)| \leq 224$.

Date: September 13, 2016.
This research was partially supported by NSFC (No. 11471076).

Unfortunately, the number of matroids with rank at most 11 and size at most 224 is massive. There are too many matroids! The bound is outside what we are able to check with a computer. The search space is just too large.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let G be a graph. Set $|G| := |V(G)|$. For a vertex v of G, let $st_G(v)$ denote the set of all edges adjacent with v. An edge of G is a *link* if its end-vertices are distinct; otherwise it is a *loop*. Let $\mathrm{loop}(G)$ be the set consisting of loops of G. We say that G is *2-edge-connected* if each edge of G is contained in some cycle. A graph obtained from graph G with some edges of G replaced by internally disjoint paths is a *subdivision* of G.

Let $e, f \in E(G)$. If $\{e, f\}$ is a cycle, then e and f are *a parallel pair*. A *parallel class* of G is a maximal subset P of $E(G)$ such that any two members of P are a parallel pair and no member is a loop. Moreover, if $|P| \geq 2$ then P is *non-trivial*; otherwise P is *trivial*. Let $\mathrm{si}(G)$ denote the graph obtained from G by deleting all loops and all but one distinguished element of each non-trivial parallel class. Obviously, the graph we obtain is uniquely determined up to a renaming of the distinguished elements. If $G = \mathrm{si}(G)$, then G is *simple*.

Two elements are a *series pair* of a graph (or matroid N) if and only if each cycle (or circuit) can not intersect them in exactly one element and they are contained in at least one cycle (or circuit). A *series class* is a maximal set X of a graph (or matroid) such that every two elements of X form a series pair. Let $\mathrm{co}(G)$ (or $\mathrm{co}(N)$) denote a graph (or matroid) obtained from G (or N) by contracting all cut-edges (or coloops) from G (or N) and then, for each series class X, contracting all but one distinguished element of X. Obviously, the graph we obtain is uniquely determined up to a renaming of the distinguished elements. We say that G is *cosimple* if G has no cut-edges or non-trivial series classes.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that $L(G)$ has at least two circuits. Then $\{e, f\}$ is a series pair of $L(G)$ if and only if $\{e, f\}$ is a series pair of G.*

Proof. First we prove the "if" part. Since each cycle of G can not contain exactly one edge of $\{e, f\}$, each circuit of $L(G)$ can not contain exactly one element of $\{e, f\}$. So $\{e, f\}$ is a series pair of $L(G)$.

Secondly we prove the "only if" part. Assume otherwise. Then there are cycles C_e, C_f of G with $\{e\} = C_e \cap \{e, f\}, \{f\} = C_f \cap \{e, f\}$. On the other hand, since $L(G)$ has at least two circuits, some circuit in $L(G)$ does not contain f. So, besides C_e there is another cycle C of G with $f \notin C$. Hence, there is a circuit X of $L(G)$ with $e \in X \subseteq C_e \cup C$. Since $f \notin C_e \cup C$, we have that $\{e, f\}$ is not a series pair of $L(G)$, a contradiction. □

Note that when $L(G)$ has only one circuit, Lemma 2.1 is not true.

Remark 2.2. *Note that a matroid N has at least two circuits if and only if $r^*(N) \geq 2$. Hence, by Lemma 2.1, when $r^*(L(G)) \geq 2$, the set $\{e, f\}$ is a series pair of $L(G)$ if and only if $\{e, f\}$ is a series pair of G.*

Let G a connected graph with cycles. Since a connected spanning subgraph of G with a unique cycle is a basis of $L(G)$, we have $r(L(G)) = |G|$ and $st_G(v) - \mathrm{loop}(G)$ is a union of cocircuits of $L(G)$ for each vertex v of G. Moreover, when $r^*(L(G)) \geq 2$, by Remark 2.2 we have $r(\mathrm{co}(L(G))) = |\mathrm{co}(G)|$. In the rest of the paper, we will use these properties frequently without reference.

Given a set X of edges, let $G|X$ denote the subgraph of G with edge set X and no isolated vertices. Let (X_1, X_2) be a partition of $E(G)$ with $V(G|X_1) \cap V(G|X_2) =$

$\{u_1, u_2\}$. We say that G' is obtained by a *Whitney switching* on G on $\{u_1, u_2\}$ if G' is a graph obtained by identifying vertices u_1, u_2 of $G|X_1$ with vertices u_2, u_1 of $G|X_2$, respectively. A graph G' is *2-isomorphic* to G if G' is obtained from G by a sequence of the operations: Whitney switchings, identifying two vertices from distinct components of a graph, or partitioning a graph into components each of which is a block of the original graph. For graphic matroids, Whitney [7] proved

Theorem 2.3. *(Whitney's 2-Isomorphism Theorem.) Let G_1 and G_2 be graphs. Then $M(G_1) \cong M(G_2)$ if and only if G_1 and G_2 are 2-isomorphic.*

Let N be a bicircular lift matroid . If G is a graph satisfying $N = L(G)$, then we say that G is a *bicircular lift graphic representation* of N. Evidently, by Whitney's 2-Isomorphic Theorem, each graph that is 2-isomorphic to G is a bicircular lift graphic representation of N. So, we can assume that G is connected. In fact, we proved

Theorem 2.4. *(*[2]*, Corollary 1.3.) Let G_1 and G_2 be connected graphs with $L(G_1) = L(G_2)$ and such that $L(G_1)$ has at least two circuits. If $|\mathrm{co}(G_1)| \geq 5$ then G_1 and G_2 are 2-isomorphic.*

The following obvious results about bicircular lift matroids will be used without reference.

(a) $L(G)$ has no loops.
(b) At most one component of $L(G)$ has circuits.
(c) $L(G)$ is connected if and only if G is 2-edge-connected and has at least two cycles.

3. The Non-connected Case

In this section, we prove that if an excluded minor M is not connected then it is a direct sum of $U_{2,4}$ and a loop. To prove this, first we need to prove that matroids $M^*(K_5), M^*(K_{3,3}), F_7$ and F_7^* are excluded minors of $\overline{BL}$.

Tutte [6] proved

Theorem 3.1. *(*[3]*, Theorem 10.3.1.) A matroid is graphic if and only if it has no minor isomorphic to $U_{2,4}, F_7, F_7^*, M^*(K_5)$ and $M^*(K_{3,3})$.*

Let $\mathcal{E}x$ be the set of excluded minors of $\overline{BL}$.

Lemma 3.2. $M^*(K_5) \in \mathcal{E}x$.

Proof. Since $M^*(K_5)$ is an excluded minor of the class of graphic matroids by Theorem 3.1, it suffices to show that $M^*(K_5)$ has no graphic bicircular lift representation. Assume to the contrary that $M^*(K_5) = L(G)$ for some graph G. Evidently, $|G| = 6$ and G has at most one loop. Since $M^*(K_5)$ has no triangle, each non-trivial parallel class of G has exactly two edges. For each 4-element circuit C in $M^*(K_5)$, the graph $G|C$ has three possible structures: (1) two non-trivial parallel classes, (2) a union of a triangle and a loop, and (3) a theta-subgraph with exactly four edges. Note that each element is in exactly two 4-element circuits in $M^*(K_5)$ and the element is the unique common element of the two 4-element circuits. Since G can not have a loop and a 2-element parallel class at the same time, G has no loops. That is, (1) or (3) happens, so the matroid $M^*(K_5)$ has two 4-element circuits with at least two common elements, which is not possible. □

Lemma 3.3. $M^*(K_{3,3}) \in \mathcal{E}x$.

Proof. Since $M^*(K_{3,3})$ is an excluded minor of the class of graphic matroids by Theorem 3.1, it suffices to show that $M^*(K_{3,3})$ has no graphic bicircular lift representation. Assume to the contrary that $M^*(K_{3,3}) = L(G)$ for some graph G. Evidently, $|V(G)| = 4$ and G has at most one loop. For each 3-element circuit C in $M^*(K_{3,3})$, either $G|C$ is a parallel class with exactly three edges or $G|C$ is a union of a 2-element parallel class and a loop. Moreover, since each element is in exactly two 3-element circuits, there are triangles C_1, C_2 of $M^*(K_{3,3})$ with exactly one common element such that $L(G)|C_1 \cup C_2 = U_{2,5}$, a contradiction as $M^*(K_{3,3})$ has no $U_{2,5}$-minors. □

Using a similar strategy as the proof of Lemma 3.3 we can prove

Lemma 3.4. $F_7 \in \mathcal{E}x$.

Lemma 3.5. $F_7^* \in \mathcal{E}x$.

Proof. Since F_7^* is an excluded minor of the class of graphic matroids by Theorem 3.1, it suffices to show that F_7^* has no graphic bicircular lift representation. Assume to the contrary that $F_7^* = L(G)$ for some graph G. Evidently, $|V(G)| = 4$ and G has at most one loop. Since F_7^* has no triangle, each non-trivial parallel class in G has exactly two edges and if G has a loop then G has no non-trivial parallel class. Hence, if G has a loop, then G is a union of K_4 and a loop; so $L(G)$ has 5-element circuits, a contradiction as F_7^* has no 5-element circuits. Hence, G has no loops. Moreover, since F_7^* has no 5-element circuits and the simple graph $\mathrm{si}(G)$ of G is connected, $\mathrm{si}(G)$ is a 4-element cycle or a union of a triangle T and a cut-edge e, for otherwise some parallel class of G has three elements. When $\mathrm{si}(G)$ is a 4-element cycle, since G has at least one 2-element cycle, F_7^* has a 5-element cycle, a contradiction. So the later case happens. Since G is 2-edge-connected, there is an edge f of G such that $\{e, f\}$ is a cycle of G. Hence, $T \cup \{e, f\}$ is a 5-element circuit of F_7^*, which is not possible. □

By Theorem 3.1 and Lemmas 3.2-3.5, we may assume that all excluded minors of $\overline{BL}$ and non-graphic bicircular lift matroid have a $U_{2,4}$-minor. The result will be used without reference.

A matroid is *free* if it has no circuits. Let N_1, N_2 be matroids on disjoint sets. The *direct sum* of N_1, N_2, denoted by $N_1 \oplus N_2$, is defined on the ground set $E(N_1) \cup E(N_2)$ with $\mathcal{C}(N_1 \oplus N_2) = \mathcal{C}(N_1) \cup \mathcal{C}(N_2)$. Let G_1, G_2 be vertex-disjoint graphs. The *direct sum* of G_1, G_2, denoted by $G_1 \oplus G_2$, is a graph with $V(G_1 \oplus G_2) = V(G_1) \cup V(G_2)$ and $E(G_1 \oplus G_2) = E(G_1) \cup E(G_2)$.

Recall that M is an excluded minor of $\overline{BL}$.

Theorem 3.6. *Either M is connected or M is a direct sum of $U_{2,4}$ and a loop.*

Proof. Assume that $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ for some matroids M_1, M_2. Assume that M_1 is free. Let G_1 be a tree with $E(G_1) = E(M_1)$, and let G_2 be a graphic representation or graphic bicircular lift representation of M_2. Then $G_1 \oplus G_2$ is a graphic representation or graphic bicircular lift representation of M, a contradiction. So neither M_1 nor M_2 is free.

Since M has a $U_{2,4}$-minor, one of M_1 and M_2 (say M_1) has a $U_{2,4}$-minor. Since M_2 has a circuit, M contains a minor as a direct sum of $U_{2,4}$ and a loop. Moreover, since a direct sum of $U_{2,4}$ and a loop is in $\mathcal{E}x$, the matroid M is a direct sum of $U_{2,4}$ and a loop. □

(The second paragraph of the proof of Theorem 3.6 was given by the referee, which is much simpler than the one that the author gave.) Therefore, in the rest of the paper, we assume that M is connected.

4. THE 2-CONNECTED CASE

In this section, we prove that if an excluded minor M is connected then it is 3-connected.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\{e, f\}$ be a series pair of a matroid N. Then N/e is in $\overline{BL}$ if and only if N is in $\overline{BL}$.*

Proof. Evidently, it suffices to prove the "only if" part. Let G be a graphic or bicircular lift representation of N/e. Then the graph obtained from G by replacing f with a 2-edge-path labelled by $\{e, f\}$ is a graphic or graphic bicircular lift representation of N. So N is in $\overline{BL}$. □

By Lemma 4.1 we have

Corollary 4.2. *M has no series classes.*

Lemma 4.3. *The graphic matroid of a subdivision of K_4 is not bicircular lift.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.1 it suffices to show that $M(K_4)$ is not bicircular lift. Assume to the contrary that $M(K_4) = L(G)$ for some graph G. For each triangle C in K_4, the graph $G|C$ is a theta-graph or a union of a loop and a 2-element cycle. Moreover, since each edge of K_4 is in exactly two triangles and G has at most one loop, there are triangles C_1, C_2 of K_4 with exactly one common element such that $L(G)|C_1 \cup C_2 = U_{2,5}$, a contradiction as $M(K_4)$ has no $U_{2,5}$-minors. □

For an integer $n \geq 2$, let K_2^n be the graph obtained from K_2 with its unique edge replaced by n parallel edges. A subdivision of K_2^3 is a *theta-graph*.

Lemma 4.4. *If the graphic matroid of a 2-edge-connected graph H is bicircular lift, then H is a subdivision of K_2^n for some integer $n \geq 2$.*

Proof. Assume $M(H) = L(G)$ for some graph G. Since bicircular lift matroid can not have loops, H has no loops. Assume that there are cycles C_1, C_2 in H with at most one common vertex. Then there is no circuit in $M(H)$ contained in $C_1 \cup C_2$ and intersecting with C_1 and C_2. On the other hand, since $G|C_i$ is a theta-graph or a union of two cycles with at most one common vertex for each $1 \leq i \leq 2$, some circuit C in $L(G)$ intersects C_1, C_2 with $C \subseteq C_1 \cup C_2$, a contradiction. So H hs no such cycles C_1, C_2, implying that H is 2-connected as H is 2-edge-connected.

Let C be a cycle of H. Assume $H \neq C$. Since H is 2-connected, there is a path P such that $C \cup P$ is a theta-subgraph. When $H \neq C \cup P$, since no two cycles in H have at most one common vertex, either H is K_2^n-subdivision for some integer $n \geq 4$ or H contains a K_4-subdivision. By Lemma 4.3 the graph H is a subdivision of K_2^n. □

Let G_1, G_2 be vertex-disjoint graphs with $\{e\} = E(G_1) \cap E(G_2)$ and such that e is a loop of G_1, G_2. Let $G_1 \oplus_1^e G_2$ be the graph obtained from G_1 and G_2 by identifying their end-vertices of e and deleting e. We say that $G_1 \oplus_1^e G_2$ is a 1-*sum* of $G_1 \backslash e$ and $G_2 \backslash e$, which will be used in Section 5. Note that we do not define $G_1 \oplus_1^e G_2$ being a 1-sum of G_1 and G_2.

Let N_1, N_2 be matroids with $\{e\} = E(N_1) \cap E(N_2)$. Assume that e is neither a loop nor a coloop of N_1, N_2. Let $N_1 \oplus_2^e N_2$ or $N_1 \oplus_2 N_2$ be the matroid with ground set $(E(N_1) \cup E(N_2)) - e$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}(N_1 \oplus_2^e N_2) =& \mathcal{C}(N_1 \backslash e) \cup \mathcal{C}(N_2 \backslash e) \\ & \cup \{(C_1 - e) \cup (C_2 - e) |\ e \in C_i \in \mathcal{C}(N_i) \text{ for each } i\}.\end{aligned}$$

We say that $N_1 \oplus_2^e N_2$ or $N_1 \oplus_2 N_2$ is a 2-*sum* of N_1 and N_2.

Let k be a positive integer. A partition (X, Y) of the ground set of a matroid N is a k-*separation* if $|X|, |Y| \geq k$ and $r(X) + r(Y) - r(N) \leq k - 1$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let N, N_1, N_2 be matroids with $N = N_1 \oplus_2^e N_2$. If N is bicircular lift, then there are graphs G_1, G_2 with $N = L(G_1 \oplus_1^e G_2)$ and with $N_i = L(G_i)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq 2$.*

Proof. Since every bicircular lift matroid has at most one component having circuits, without loss of generality we can assume that N is connected. So N_1, N_2 are connected. Let G be a connected graph with $N = L(G)$ and with $V(G|E(N_1) - e) \cap V(G|E(N_2) - e)$ as small as possible. Set $c := |V(G|E(N_1) - e) \cap V(G|E(N_2) - e)|$. Assume that $c = 1$. Let G^+ be the graph obtained by adding a loop labelled e incident with the vertex shared by $E(N_1) - e$ and $E(N_2) - e$ in G. Let $G_i = G^+|E(N_i)$ for each integer $1 \leq i \leq 2$. We claim that $N_i = L(G_i)$. Let C be a circuit of N intersecting $E(N_1) - e$ and $E(N_2) - e$, and let $e_{3-i} \in C \cap (E(N_{3-i}) - e)$. Since $N = L(G)$, we have that $C \cap E(N_{3-i})$ is a cycle of G_{3-i}; so G_i is isomorphic to $(G/C \cap (E(N_{3-i}) - e_{3-i}))|E(N_i) - e + e_{3-i}$. Moreover, since $N_i \cong (N/C \cap (E(N_{3-i}) - e_{3-i}))|E(N_i) - e + e_{3-i}$, the claim holds.

Now we prove that $c = 1$. Assume otherwise. Then $c \geq 2$ as G is connected. For $1 \leq i \leq 2$, set $n_i := |G|E(N_i) - e|$ and let c_i be the number of components in $G|E(N_i) - e$. Since G is connected and has cycles, $r(N) = n_1 + n_2 - c$. Since G is chosen with c as small as possible, each component of $G|E(N_i) - e$ shares at least two vertices with $G|E(N_{3-i}) - e$. So $c \geq 2max\{c_1, c_2\}$. On the other hand, since N_i has circuits, $G|E(N_i) - e$ has cycles; so $r(E(N_i) - e) = n_i - c_i + 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & r(E(N_1) - e) + r(E(N_2) - e) - r(N) \\ &= n_1 - c_1 + 1 + n_2 - c_2 + 1 - (n_1 + n_2 - c) \\ &= c - c_1 - c_2 + 2 \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $(E(N_1) - e, E(N_2) - e)$ is not a 2-separation of N, a contradiction. So $c = 1$. □

We need three more results to prove the main result of the section.

Lemma 4.6. *(*[3]*, Proposition 4.3.7.) Let N_1 be a connected minor of a connected matroid N and $f \in E(N) - E(N_1)$. Then at least one of $N\backslash f$ or N/f is connected having N_1 as a minor.*

Bixby [1] proved that

Lemma 4.7. *(*[3]*, Proposition 12.3.7.) Let N be a connected matroid having a $U_{2,4}$-minor and $e \in E(N)$. Then N has a $U_{2,4}$-minor minor using e.*

Lemma 4.8. *(*[2]*, Corollary 5.) Let G_1, G_2 be graphs with $L(G_1) = L(G_2)$, and let e be a loop of both G_1 and G_2. Then G_1 and G_2 are 2-isomorphic.*

Theorem 4.9. *If M is connected then M is 3-connected.*

Proof. Assume to the contrary that $M = M_1 \oplus_2^e M_2$ for some connected matroid M_1, M_2 with at least three elements. Evidently, either M_1 or M_2 is non-graphic for otherwise M is graphic. By symmetry we may assume that M_1 is non-graphic. Then Lemmas 3.1-3.5 imply that M_1 has a $U_{2,4}$-minor. We claim that there is a graph G_1 with $M_1 = L(G_1)$ such that e is a loop of G_1. By Lemma 4.6 for each $f \in E(M_2) - e$ either M/f or $M\backslash f$ is connected having $U_{2,4}$ as a minor. Without loss of generality assume that the former case

happens. Since $M/f = M_1 \oplus_2^e (M_2/f)$ and M/f is bicircular lift, the claim follows from Lemma 4.5.

We claim that $M_1 = U_{2,4}$. Assume otherwise. Then by Lemmas 4.6 and 4.7 for some $f \in E(M_1) - e$ either $M\backslash f$ or M/f is connected having $U_{2,4}$ as a minor. Without loss of generality assume that the latter case happens. Since M/f is bicircular lift, by Lemma 4.5 there are graphs G_1', G_2 with $M/f = L(G_1' \oplus_1^e G_2)$, $M_1/f = L(G_1')$ and with $M_2 = L(G_2)$. Since there is a graph G_1 with $M_1 = L(G_1)$ such that e is a loop of G_1, by Lemma 4.8 we have that G_1/f and G_1' are 2-isomorphic, that is, a set is a cycle of G_1/f if and only if it is a cycle of G_1'. Moreover, since $M/f = L(G_1' \oplus_1^e G_2)$ and $M_1 = L(G_1)$, it is easy to verify that $M = L(G_1 \oplus_1^e G_2)$, a contradiction. So $M_1 = U_{2,4}$.

If M_2 is non-graphic, then by symmetry $M_2 = U_{2,4}$, which is not possible as $M = U_{2,4} \oplus_2 U_{2,4}$ is bicircular lift. So assume that M_2 is graphic. Since $U_{2,4} \oplus_2 U_{1,k}$ is bicircular lift for each integer $k \geq 3$, we may further assume that $r(M_2) \geq 2$. Hence, by the definition of 2-sum there is an element $f \in E(M_2) - e$ such that M/f has a $U_{2,4}$-minor. Since M/f is bicircular lift and has no coloops, M/f is connected; so M_2/f is connected. Moreover, by Lemma 4.5 the matroid M_2/f is bicircular lift. Since M_2 is graphic, by Lemma 4.4 there is a K_2^n-subdivision H for some integer $n \geq 2$ with $M_2/f = M(H)$. Since M has no series pairs by Corollary 4.2, each series pair of M_2 must contain e, so the graph H has at most one 2-edge path and the path must contain e when it exists. (Note that in the paper we do not see cycles as paths.) On the other hand, since $M/f = M_1 \oplus_2^e M_2/f$ is bicircular lift, Lemma 4.5 implies that e is a loop of some graphic bicircular lift representation of M_2/f. So $H = K_2^n$, that is, $M_2/f = U_{1,n}$. Hence, $\mathrm{si}(M_2) = U_{2,3}$ as M_2 is a connected graphic matroid. Since $U_{2,4} \oplus_2 U_{2,3}$ is bicircular lift, M_2 has at least one non-trivial parallel class. We claim that M_2 has a unique non-trivial parallel class and the non-trivial parallel class contains e. Assume otherwise. Then there is an element $e' \in E(M_2) - e$ such that M/e' has a loop and $U_{2,4}$-minors, so M/e' is not in $\overline{BL}$, which is not possible. So the claim holds, implying that M is bicircular lift, a contradiction. □

By Theorems 3.6 and 4.9, in the rest of the paper we may assume that M is 3-connected.

5. The 3-connected Case

In this section, we prove that when an excluded minor M is 3-connected and has a $U_{2,4}$-minor, we have $r(M) \leq 11$ and $|E(M)| \leq 224$. To prove this, we need introduce the following well-known result in matroid theory, which was proved by Seymour [5].

Theorem 5.1. *(Splitter Theorem.) (*[3]*, Corollary 12.2.1.) Let N and N' be 3-connected matroids such that N' is a minor of N with at least four elements and if N' is a wheel then N has no larger wheel as a minor, while if N' is a whirl then N has no larger whirl as a minor. Then there is a sequence $N_0, N_1, \ldots, N_n$ of 3-connected matroids such that $N_0 \cong N$, $N_n \cong N'$, and for all integers $1 \leq i \leq n$, N_i is a single-element deletion or a single-element contraction of N_{i-1}.*

Lemma 5.2. *Let N be a 3-connected matroid with $U_{2,4}$-minors and $r^*(N) \geq 3$. Then there is $e \in E(N)$ such that* $\mathrm{co}(N\backslash e)$ *is 3-connected with $U_{2,4}$-minors.*

Proof. Evidently, N is not a wheel. When N is a whirl, the result is obviously true. So we may assume that N is not a whirl. Let N' be the largest whirl over all minors of N. By the Splitter Theorem there is a sequence $N_0, N_1, \ldots, N_n$ of 3-connected matroids such that $N_0 \cong N$, $N_n \cong N'$, and for all integers $1 \leq i \leq n$, N_i is a single-element deletion or

a single-element contraction of N_{i-1}. Assume that some N_i is a single-element deletion of N_{i-1}. Let k be the minimum integer in $\{1,\dots,n\}$ satisfying $N_k = N_{k-1}\backslash e_k$. Then $\mathrm{co}(N\backslash e_k)$ is 3-connected with $U_{2,4}$-minors. So we may assume that all N_i are single-element contractions of N_{i-1}. Then $r^*(N') = r^*(N) \geq 3$. Moreover, since $r^*(U_{2,4}) = 2$, the matroid N' is a whirl but $N' \ncong U_{2,4}$. Then there is an element e in N' such that $\mathrm{co}(N'\backslash e)$ is 3-connected with $U_{2,4}$-minors. Hence, $\mathrm{co}(N\backslash e)$ is 3-connected with $U_{2,4}$-minors. □

Lemma 5.3. *Let N be a connected bicircular lift matroid with $r^*(N) \geq 3$. Then for each $e \in E(N)$ we have $r(\mathrm{co}(N\backslash e)) \geq r(\mathrm{co}(N)) - 2$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that N has no series pairs. Let G be a graph with $N = L(G)$. Then $N\backslash e = L(G\backslash e)$. Since N has no series pairs, $N\backslash e$ has no coloops and by Remark 2.2 the graph G has no series pairs. Let S be a series class in $N\backslash e$. Since $r^*(N\backslash e) \geq 2$, by Remark 2.2 again S is also a series class of $G\backslash e$. Hence, when $|S| \geq 3$, there is no way to put e back in $G\backslash e$ such that G has no series pairs. So $|S| = 2$. Moreover, when $N\backslash e$ has at least three series classes, it is also no way to put e back to $G\backslash e$ such that G has no series pairs. Hence, $N\backslash e$ has at most two series class and each series class has at most two elements. Hence, $r(\mathrm{co}(N\backslash e)) \geq r(N) - 2$ as $N\backslash e$ has no coloops. □

Lemma 5.4. *When $r^*(M) \geq 3$, there is an element $e \in E(M)$ with $r(\mathrm{co}(M\backslash e)) \geq r(M) - 3$ and such that $\mathrm{co}(M\backslash e)$ is 3-connected with $U_{2,4}$-minors.*

Proof. Evidently, $M \neq U_{2,4}$ and when M is a whirl the result holds. So we may assume that M is not a whirl. By the Splitter Theorem there is an element $f \in E(M)$ such that M/f or $M\backslash f$ is 3-connected with $U_{2,4}$-minors. If $M\backslash f$ is 3-connected with $U_{2,4}$-minors then the corollary holds. So we may assume that M/f is 3-connected with $U_{2,4}$-minors. By Lemma 5.2 there is an element $e \in E(M/f)$ such that $\mathrm{co}(M/f\backslash e)$ is 3-connected with $U_{2,4}$-minors. Moreover, since M/f is bicircular lift with $r^*(M/f) = r^*(M) \geq 3$, by Lemma 5.3 we have $r(\mathrm{co}(M/f\backslash e)) \geq r(M/f) - 2$. So $r(\mathrm{co}(M\backslash e)) \geq r(M) - 3$. □

Lemma 5.5. *Let N be a matroid and G a graph satisfying $N = L(G)$. Assume that N is non-graphic with $r(\mathrm{co}(N)), r^*(N) \geq 4$. Then for each element $e \in E(G)$, if e is a link of G, then N/e is non-graphic; and if e is a loop or contained in some non-trivial parallel pair of G, then $N\backslash e$ is non-graphic.*

Proof. Evidently, we can assume that N is connected. So G is 2-edge-connected. When e is a link of G that is not contained in any non-trivial parallel pair, set $G_e := G/e, N_e := N/e$; when e is a loop of G, set $G_e := G\backslash e, N_e := N\backslash e$; and when e is contained in some non-trivial parallel pair, G_e and N_e can be defined as the first case or the second case. Evidently, $N_e = L(G_e)$. Next we prove that N_e is non-graphic. Assume N_e is graphic.

First consider the case that G_e is 2-edge-connected. Then N_e is a connected graphic bicircular lift matroid . By Lemma 4.4 we have $r(\mathrm{co}(N_e)) \in \{0, 1\}$. On the other hand, since $r(\mathrm{co}(N)), r^*(N) \geq 4$, by Lemma 5.3 we have $r(\mathrm{co}(N\backslash e)) \geq 2$. Moreover, since $r(\mathrm{co}(N/e)) \geq r(\mathrm{co}(N)) - 1 \geq 3$, we have $r(\mathrm{co}(N_e)) \geq 2$, a contradiction.

Secondly, consider the case that G_e is not 2-edge-connected. Since G is 2-edge-connected, $G_e = G - e$ and the non-trivial parallel class P containing e has exactly two elements, say e, f, and P is also a series class of G. So $G\backslash\{e, f\}$ is 2-edge-connected and

$$\mathrm{co}(N\backslash e, f) = \mathrm{co}(N\backslash e/f) = \mathrm{co}(\mathrm{co}(N/f)\backslash e) \cong \mathrm{co}(\mathrm{co}(N)\backslash e).$$

Therefore, since $r^*(\mathrm{co}(N)) = r^*(N) \geq 4$ and $\mathrm{co}(N)$ is connected, Lemma 5.3 implies $r(\mathrm{co}(N\backslash e, f)) \geq r(\mathrm{co}(N)) - 2 \geq 2$. On the other hand, since $G\backslash\{e, f\}$ is 2-edge-connected and $N_e = N\backslash e$ is graphic, by Lemma 4.4 we have $r(\mathrm{co}(N\backslash e, f)) \in \{0, 1\}$, a contradiction. □

Let n be a positive integer. Let C be a cycle of a graph G and $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \in V(C)$. Assume that $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ occurs in this order circularly on C. For any two distinct x_i and x_j, the cycle C contains two (x_i, x_j)-paths. Let $C[x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_j]$ denote the (x_i, x_j)-path in C containing $x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_j$ (and not containing x_{j+1} if $i \neq j + 1$), where subscripts are modulo n. Such path is uniquely determined when $n \geq 3$. Similarly, set

$$C(x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_j) = C[x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_j] - \{x_i, x_j\},$$
$$C(x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_j] = C[x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_j] - \{x_i\}.$$

Lemma 5.6. *When $r(M) \geq 12$ and $r^*(M) \geq 5$, there are connected graphs G_1, G_2 and elements $e_1, e_2 \in E(M)$ such that the following hold.*

(1) $M\backslash e_1 = L(G_1), M\backslash e_2 = L(G_2)$,
(2) $G_1\backslash e_2 = G_2\backslash e_1$ *and* $G_1\backslash e_2$ *is connected,*
(3) $\mathrm{si}(G_1\backslash e_2)$ *is 2-connected or a 1-sum of a 2-connected graph and a link e such that the parallel class of $G_1\backslash e_2$ containing e has exactly two edges.*

Proof. Since M is 3-connected and has $U_{2,4}$-minors, by Lemmas 5.2-5.4 there are elements $e_1, e_2 \in E(M)$ such that $\mathrm{co}(M\backslash e_1, e_2)$ is 3-connected and has a $U_{2,4}$-minor and with $r(\mathrm{co}(M\backslash e_1, e_2)) \geq 7$ and such that e_1, e_2 are not contained in a triad of M. Since $\mathrm{co}(M\backslash e_1, e_2)$ is non-graphic, by Theorem 2.4, there are connected graphs G_1, G_2 and 2-isomorphic connected graphs G_{12}, G'_{12} such that

$$M\backslash e_1, e_2 = L(G_{12}) = L(G'_{12}),$$
$$M\backslash e_1 = L(G_1), \;\; M\backslash e_2 = L(G_2),$$
$$G_{12} = G_1\backslash e_2, \;\; G'_{12} = G_2\backslash e_1.$$

Since $\mathrm{co}(M\backslash e_1, e_2)$ is 3-connected and e_1, e_2 are not contained in a triad of M, **(a)** G_{12} is 2-edge-connected with at most one loop; **(b)** $\mathrm{si}(G_{12})$ is 2-connected or a 1-sum of a 2-connected graph and a link e such that the parallel class P_e of G_{12} containing e has exactly two edges, for otherwise $\mathrm{co}(M\backslash e_1, e_2)$ has a 2-separation. Evidently, (a)-(b) also hold for G'_{12}, and to prove the lemma it suffices to show that $G_{12} = G'_{12}$. Assume to the contrary that $G_{12} \neq G'_{12}$ and G_{12}, G'_{12} are chosen such that one can obtained from the other by as few Whitney Switching as possible.

Since $r^*(M\backslash e_1, e_2) = r^*(M) - 2 \geq 3$, we have $|G_{12}| = r(M\backslash e_1, e_2) \geq 7$. Evidently, for $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$, the edge e_i is neither a loop nor a cut-edge of G_j for otherwise it is easy to prove $G_{12} = G'_{12}$. Let $X \subseteq E(M) - \{e_1, e_2\}$ such that **(c)** $G_2|X \cup e_1$ is a theta-subgraph and $G_2|X$ is a cycle or a 1-sum of e and a cycle. By (b) such X obviously exists. No matter which case happens, let C be the unique cycle in $G_2|X$. Since G_{12}, G'_{12} are 2-isomorphic, C is also a cycle of G_1. Let $X_1, X_2 \subseteq X$ such that $X_1 \cup e_1$ and $X_2 \cup e_1$ are cycles in G_2. Evidently, when $e \notin X$, we have $C = X$ and (X_1, X_2) is a partition of C; and when $e \in X$, we have $e \in X_1 \cap X_2$, $C = X - e$ and $(X_1 - e, X_2 - e)$ is a partition of C.

Claim 1. *Neither $G_1|X_1$ nor $G_1|X_2$ is a path.*

Subproof. Assume to the contrary that $G_1|X_2$ is a path. Then $G_1|X_1$ and $G_1|X_2$ are paths having the same end-vertices as C is a cycle of G_{12} and G'_{12}. Let x_1, y_1 (and x'_1, y'_1) be

the end-vertices of $G_1|X_1$ (and $G_2|X_1$). That is, the end-vertices of e_1 in G_2 are x_1', y_1'. Since G_{12}, G_{12}' are 2-isomorphic and X_1 and X_2 are paths in G_{12} and G_{12}', we have that P is a path in G_{12} joining x_1, y_1 if and only if it is a path in G_{12}' joining x_1', y_1'. (Note that the orders of edges in $G_{12}|P$ and $G_{12}'|P$ may be not the same.) Hence, since $M\backslash e_1, e_2 = L(G_{12}) = L(G_{12}')$, it is easily to check that the graph obtained from G_{12} by adding the edge e_1 connecting x_1 and y_1 is a graphic bicircular lift representation of $M\backslash e_2$. Hence, by the choice of G_{12}, G_{12}' we have $G_{12} = G_{12}'$, a contradiction. □

Claim 1 implies that $|X| \geq 4$ when $e \notin X$. Moreover, by the choice of G_{12} and G_{12}' we have

Claim 2. *For each graph G_1' 2-isomorphic to G_1, neither $G_1'|X_1$ nor $G_1'|X_2$ is a path.*

To prove Claim 3 we need two more definitions. A path is a *X_1-path* if its edges are in X_1. Let $f = uv$ be a link of a graph H, and let w be the vertex obtained by contracting f. If for every 2-vertex-cut of H/f containing w, say $\{w, z\}$, either $\{u, z\}$ or $\{v, z\}$ is a 2-vertex-cut of H, then we say that *no new 2-vertex-cuts appear when f is contracted in H*. Evidently, for some link f in $E(G_1) - e_2$ if neither $G_1/f|(X_1 - f)$ nor $G_1/f|(X_2 - f)$ is a path and no new 2-vertex-cuts appear when f is contracted in G_1, then for each graph G_f^2 that is 2-isomorphic to G_1/f, neither $G_f^2|X_1 - f$ nor $G_f^2|X_2 - f$ is a path.

Claim 3. *There is an edge f in $E(G_{12})$ such that at least one of the following holds.*

(I) *When G_1 is not simple, we have*
  (i) *$M\backslash e_1, f$ is non-graphic; and*
  (ii) *for each graph G_f^2 that is 2-isomorphic to $G_1\backslash f$, neither $G_f^2|X_1 - f$ nor $G_f^2|X_2 - f$ is a path.*

(II) *When G_1 is simple, we have*
  (i) *$M\backslash e_1/f$ is non-graphic; and*
  (ii) *for each graph G_f^2 that is 2-isomorphic to G_1/f, neither $G_f^2|X_1 - f$ nor $G_f^2|X_2 - f$ is a path.*

Subproof. When G_1 is not simple, let f be a loop or an edge in a non-trivial parallel pair. Since $M\backslash e_1$ is non-graphic and $r^*(M\backslash e_1) = r^*(M) - 1 \geq 4$, by Lemma 5.5 the matroid $M\backslash e_1, f$ is non-graphic. Moreover, since $G_1\backslash f$ and G_1 have the same 2-vertex-cuts, (I) (ii) holds from Claim 2. So (I) holds.

We may therefore assume that G_1 is a simple graph. (b) implies that G_{12} is 2-connected, so by (c) we have $C = X$. For each edge $f \in E(G_{12})$, Lemma 5.5 implies that $M\backslash e_1/f$ is non-graphic. So it suffices to show that (II) (ii) holds.

We claim that every edge in G_1 has at least one endpoint on C. Assume to the contrary that there is an edge f of G_1 that has no endpoints on C. Evidently, $f \neq e_2$ and C is also a cycle of G_1/f and neither $G_1/f|(X_1 - f)$ nor $G_1/f|(X_2 - f)$ is a path by Claim 2. Since f and C are vertex-disjoint in G_1, for each Whitney Switching in G_1/f changing the order of edges in C there is a corresponding Whitney Switching in G_1 playing the same role on C, then (II) (ii) follows from Claim 2.

First we consider the case $V(G_1) \neq V(G_1|C)$. Let $w \in V(G_1) - V(G_1|C)$. When $|st_{G_1}(w)| = 2$, for each edge $f \in st_{G_1}(w) - e_2$, no new 2-vertex-cuts appears when f is contracted in G_1. So we may assume that $|st_{G_1}(w)| \geq 3$. Then there is a unique minimal path P_w with $E(P_w) \subsetneq C$ such that all vertices incident with w are in $V(P_w)$. We say that P_w is the *neighbour path* of w in C. Let h be a vertex in $V(G_1) - (w \cup V(G_1|C))$ or an

edge in $E(G_1) - C$ with its end-vertices on C. We say that the neighbourhoods of w, h are *crossing* on C if there are distinct vertices $u, v, a, b \in V(G_1|C)$ with u, v adjacent with w and a, b adjacent with or incident to h such that (u, a, v, b) appears in this order circularly on C.

We claim that if the neighbourhoods of w, h are crossing on C then (II) (ii) holds. When u is the unique vertex in $C(a, u, b)$ adjacent with w, it is obvious that there is no 3-vertex-cut $\{w, u, x\}$ of G_1 with x is on the (a, b)-path of C containing u; moreover, since the neighbourhoods of w, h are crossing on C, vertices a and b are connected in $G_1 - \{w, u, y\}$ for each internal vertex y on the (a, b)-path of C not containing u. Hence, no new 2-vertex-cuts that change the order of edges on C appear after the edge wu is contracted. So by symmetry we may assume that there are vertices $u_1 \in C(a, u, b) - u$ and $v_1 \in C(a, v, b) - v$ adjacent with w such that (u, u_1, a, v_1, v, b) appears in the order circularly in C. Without loss of generality we may further assume that $e_2 \notin \{wu, wv_1\}$ and u and v_1 are the unique vertices in $C(b, u, u_1)$ and $C(a, v_1, v)$ respectively, which are adjacent with w. Hence, **(d)** when wu (or wv_1) is contracted, besides the vertex obtained by contracting the edge, the other vertex contained in a new 2-vertex-cut is in $C(u_1, a]$ (or $C(v, b]$). Assume that (II) (ii) does not hold when $f \in \{wu, wv_1\}$. Since no 2-vertex-cut of G_1/wu or G_1/wv_1 has one vertex in $C(b, u, u_1, a)$ and the other in $C(a, v_1, v, b)$, by Claim 2 and (d) the paths $C[b, u, u_1, a]$ and $C[a, v_1, v, b]$ intersect X_1 and X_2. Moreover, since (II) (ii) does not hold when $f \in \{wu, wv_1\}$, by (d) we have that **(e)** for some graph G_u 2-isomorphic to G_1/wu, the path $G_u|C[a, v_1, v, b]$ is a union of a X_1-path and a X_2-path and the two edges in $G_u|C$ incident to b are in the same X_i; and **(f)** for some graph G_{v_1} 2-isomorphic to G_1/wv_1, the path $G_{v_1}|C[b, u, u_1, a]$ is a union of a X_1-path and a X_2-path and the two edges in $G_{v_1}|C$ incident to a are in the same X_j. On the other hand, since the two vertices in a 2-vertex-cut of $G_1, G_1/wu$ or G_1/wv_1 are in $C[b, u]$, $C(u, u_1, a)$, $C[a, v_1, v]$ or $C[v, b]$, combined with (e) and (f), there is a graph G_1' 2-isomorphic to G_1 such that $G_1'|X_1$ and $G_1'|X_2$ are paths, a contradiction to Claim 2.

We may therefore assume that the neighbourhoods of w, h are non-crossing on C. Hence, **(g)** the end-vertices of a neighbor path in C of a vertex in $V(G_1) - V(G_1|C)$ consist of a 2-vertex-cut of G_1, and $|C| \geq 5$ for otherwise $|V(G_1)| \leq 6$ as $|st_{G_1}(w)| \geq 3$ for each $w \in V(G_1) - V(G_1|C)$.

Assume that (II) (ii) does not hold for each edge in $E(G_{12})$. Let G_1' be a graph 2-isomorphic to G_1 with the number of vertex disjoint X_1-paths as small as possible. Since the neighborhoods of w, h are non-crossing on C and the degree of each vertex not in C is at least three in G_1, no new 2-vertex-cut appears when an edge in some neighbor path is contracted. Hence, **(h)** $G_1'|C$ is a union of exactly two vertex-disjoint X_1-paths and exactly two vertex-disjoint X_2-paths and for each edge p in some neighbor path of a vertex in $V(G_1') - V(G_1'|C)$ when $p \in X_i$ the two edges in $G_1'|C$ adjacent with p are in X_j, where $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$. So $1 \leq |V(G_1') - V(G_1'|C)| \leq 2$. Assume that for some $w \in V(G_1') - V(G_1'|C)$ we have $|st_{G_1'}(w)| = 3$. Let u, v be the end-vertices of the neighbor path P_w of w in C. Then by (g) and (h) by a Whitney Switching on the 2-vertex-cut $\{u, v\}$ in G_1' the sets X_1 and X_2 become paths, a contradiction to Claim 2. Hence, for each $w \in V(G_1') - V(G_1'|C)$ we have $|st_{G_1'}(w)| \geq 4$. Using (h) again we have $\{w\} = V(G_1') - V(G_1'|C)$ and $G_1'|(C - P_w)$ is a X_i-path and $G_1'|P_w$ is a 3-edge path such that the internal edge is contained in X_i and the other two are contained in X_j, where $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$. On the other hand, since $|C| = |G_{12}| - 1 \geq 6$, we have $|E(G_1'|C - P_w))| \geq 3$. Let $f \in E(G_1'|(C - P_w))$. Since the neighborhoods of w and each edge in $E(G_1') - st_{G_1'}(w) - E(C)$ are non-crossing on C, for each graph G_1^f that

is 2-isomorphic to G_1'/f the graph $G_1^f|P_w$ is a 3-edge path with its internal edge in X_i. Hence, (II) (ii) holds as $E(G_1'|(C-P_w)) \subseteq X_i$.

Secondly we consider the case $V(G_1) = V(G_1|C)$. Then $|C| = |G_{12}| \geq 7$. So by Claim 1 there is an edge $f = uv \in C$ such that neither $G_1/f|(X_1 - f)$ nor $G_1/f|(X_2 - f)$ is a path. If no new 2-vertex-cuts appear after f contracted, then (II) (ii) holds. So we may assume that some new 2-vertex-cut appears when f is contracted. Then there are edges $g = uu_1, h = vv_1$ in $E(G_{12}) - C$ such that u_1, v_1 are not adjacent in C and (u, v_1, u_1, v) occurs in this order circularly in C and such that the vertex obtained by contracting f and some vertex in $C(v_1, u_1)$ consist of a 2-vertex-cut of G_1/f. Hence, by symmetry we may assume that the end-vertices of e_1 are in $C[u, v_1, u_1)$. Then $C[u, v_1, u_1] \cup \{g, e_1\}$ is a theta-subgraph. Moreover, since $C[u, v_1, u_1] \cup g$ is a cycle of G_{12} and $V(G_1) \neq V(G_1|C[u, v_1, u_1])$, the result (II) (ii) follows from the first case. □

Let f be an edge satisfying Claim 3. When Claim 3 (I) holds, set $M_f := M\backslash f, G_f^1 := G_1\backslash f$; and when Claim 3 (II) holds, set $M_f := M/f$, $G_f^1 := G_1/f$. Let G_f^2 be a graph 2-isomorphic to G_f^1 that can be extended to a graph G_f with $M_f = L(G_f)$. Since M is an excluded minor of $\overline{BL}$, by Theorem 2.4 such G_f^2 exists. For each cycle C' of $G_f^2\backslash e_2$, since C' or $C' \cup f$ is a cycle of G_{12} and $X_i \cup e_1$ is a cycle of G_2 for each $1 \leq i \leq 2$, **(i)** the set $(C' \cup X_i \cup e_1) - f$ is cyclic in M_f, where a subset Y of the ground set of a matroid N is *cyclic* in N if $N|Y$ has no coloops.

Since $M_f\backslash e_1, e_2 = L(G_f^2\backslash e_2)$ and $M_f\backslash e_1, e_2$ has at least two circuits by the fact that $r^*(M_f\backslash e_1, e_2) \geq r^*(M) - 3 \geq 2$, there is a subgraph P of $G_f^2\backslash e_2$ such that either $C \cup P$ is a theta-subgraph or C and P are cycles with at most one common vertex. When the latter case happens, since neither $G_f^2|X_1 - f$ nor $G_f^2|X_2 - f$ is a path by Claim 3, $(P \cup X_1 \cup e_1) - f$ is not cyclic in M_f, a contradiction to (i). So $C \cup P$ is a theta-subgraph. Let C_1, C_2 be the cycles in $C \cup P$ containing P, and $P_i = E(C_i) - E(P)$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2$. Since $C \cup P$ is a theta-subgraph and for any $1 \leq i, j \leq 2$ the set $(C_j \cup X_i \cup e_1) - f$ is cyclic in M_f by (i), both $P_1 - f$ and $P_2 - f$ intersect X_1 and X_2; so $G_f|X \cup P \cup e_1$ is a K_4-subdivision and C is a union of exactly two vertex-disjoint X_1-paths and exactly two vertex-disjoint X_2-paths. Moreover, since $M_f\backslash e_1, e_2 = L(G_f^2\backslash e_2)$ and $M_f\backslash e_1, e_2$ has at least two circuits, $E(G_f^2) \neq X \cup E(P)$. Hence, there is another cycle C' of $G_f^2\backslash e_2$ such that $(C' \cup X_i \cup e_1) - f$ is not cyclic in M_f, a contradiction to (i). □

Recall that $\mathrm{loop}(G)$ is the set consisting of loops of a graph G.

Lemma 5.7. *Let N be a 3-connected matroid with $r(N) \geq 10$ and $r^*(N) \geq 4$. Let G be a connected graph with $E(N) = E(G)$. Assume that all proper minors of N are in $\overline{BL}$ and there are $e_1, e_2 \in E(N)$ such that the following statements hold.*

(1) $N\backslash e_1 = L(G\backslash e_1), N\backslash e_2 = L(G\backslash e_2)$,
(2) $r(\mathrm{co}(N\backslash e_1)), r(\mathrm{co}(N\backslash e_2)) \geq 7$,
(3) $G\backslash e_1, e_2$ *is 2-edge-connected,*
(4) $\mathrm{si}(G\backslash e_1, e_2)$ *is 2-connected or a 1-sum of K_2 and a 2-connected graph.*

Then $N = L(G)$.

Proof. Since $N\backslash e_2$ is connected and $N\backslash e_2 = L(G\backslash e_2)$, the graph $G\backslash e_2$ is 2-edge-connected. Then e_1 is not a cut-edge of G. So by (1) we have

$$|V(G)| = |V(G\backslash e_1)| = r(N\backslash e_1) = r(N) \geq 10.$$

Claim 1. *For each vertex v of G, the set $st_G(v) - \mathrm{loop}(G)$ is a union of cocircuits of N.*

Subproof. Since $st_G(v) - \text{loop}(G) - e_i$ is a union of cocircuits of $N\backslash e_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq 2$ by (1), the set $st_G(v) - \text{loop}(G)$ is a union of cocircuits of N. □

Claim 2. *Let C_1, C_2 be cycles of G with at most one common vertex and with $e_1 \in C_1, e_2 \in C_2$. Then $C_1 \cup C_2 \in \mathcal{C}(N)$.*

Subproof. Assume that there is another cycle C_3 of G such that C_2 and C_3 have at most one common vertex. Without loss of generality we may further assume that either $C_1 \cup C_3$ is a theta-subgraph with $e_1 \notin C_3$ or C_1 and C_3 have at most one common vertex. Since $C_2 \cup C_3$ and $C_1 \cup C_3$ are circuits of N by (1), for any $f \in E(C_3) - E(C_1 \cup C_2)$ the set $(C_1 \cup C_2 \cup C_3) - f$ contains a circuit of N. Since a circuit and cocircuit of a matroid can not have exactly one common element, by Claim 1 we have $C_1 \cup C_2 \in \mathcal{C}(N)$. So by symmetry we may assume that except C_1, C_2 each cycle of G intersects $E(C_1)$ and $E(C_2)$, implying that G is a simple graph. Hence, by (3) and (4) the graph si$(G\backslash e_1, e_2)$ is 2-connected. Moreover, since N is 3-connected, by Claim 1 we have $\delta(G) \geq 3$, where $\delta(G)$ is the minimum degree of G.

Assume that C_1, C_2 have a common vertex v. Let P be a shortest path of G with $v \notin P$ joining C_1 and C_2. Since si$(G\backslash e_1, e_2)$ is 2-connected, such P exists. Let C_3 be the cycle of G with $P \subseteq C_3 \subseteq (C_1 \cup C_2 \cup P) - \{e_1, e_2\}$. Since $C_2 \cup C_3$ and $C_1 \cup C_3$ are circuits of N by (1), for any $f \in E(P) - E(C_1 \cup C_2)$ the set $(C_1 \cup C_2 \cup P) - f$ contains a circuit of N; so $C_1 \cup C_2 \in \mathcal{C}(N)$. So we may assume that $V(C_1) \cap V(C_2) = \emptyset$. Since $\delta(G) \geq 3$ and except C_1, C_2 each cycle of G intersects $E(C_1)$ and $E(C_2)$, **(a)** the graph G is a 3-connected 3-regular graph with $V(G) = V(C_1) \cup V(C_2)$, $|V(C_1)| = |V(C_2)|$ and such that $E(G) - E(C_1 \cup C_2)$ is a perfect matching of G.

Assume that the claim is not true. Then for each $f \in E(G) - E(C_1 \cup C_2)$ we have $C_1 \cup C_2 \cup f \in \mathcal{C}(N)$. Since $|C_1| = \frac{|V(G)|}{2} \geq 5$, there is $f' \in E(G) - E(C_1 \cup C_2)$ such that no three-edge path containing e_1, f'. Hence, co$(G\backslash e_1, f')$ is 3-connected by (a), so for every graph H 2-isomorphic to $G\backslash e_1, f'$ we have co$(H) \cong$ co$(G\backslash e_1, f')$ and each series class of $G\backslash e_1, f'$ is a path of $G\backslash e_1, f'$ and H. On the other hand, since by (2) and Lemma 5.3 we have $r(\text{co}(N\backslash e_1, f')) \geq 5$, by Lemma 4.4 the matroid $N\backslash f'$ is non-graphic. So $N\backslash f'$ is bicircular lift. Moreover, since $N\backslash e_1, f' = L(G\backslash e_1, f')$, some graph H 2-isomorphic to $G\backslash e_1, f'$ can be extended to a graphic bicircular lift representation of $N\backslash f'$ by Theorem 2.4. Since co$(H) \cong$ co$(G\backslash e_1, f')$ and each series class of $G\backslash e_1, f'$ is a path of $G\backslash e_1, f'$ and H, it is no way to add e_1 to H such that $C_1 \cup C_2 \cup f$ is a theta-subgraph or a handcuff for an edge $f \in E(G) - E(C_1 \cup C_2 \cup f')$. So $C_1 \cup C_2 \cup f \notin \mathcal{C}(N)$,a contradiction. □

Claim 3. *Each cycle of G containing e_1, e_2 is independent in N.*

Subproof. Assume to the contrary that some cycle C of G containing e_1, e_2 is dependent in N. Then $C \in \mathcal{C}(N)$ by Claim 1. Evidently, $N/e_1\backslash e_2 = L(G/e_1\backslash e_2)$ and $r(\text{co}(N/e_1\backslash e_2)) \geq 6$ by (1) and (2). Since $r(\text{co}(N/e_1)) \geq r(\text{co}(N/e_1\backslash e_2)) \geq 6$, by Lemma 4.4 the matroid N/e_1 is non-graphic. So N/e_1 is bicircular lift. Moreover, since $r^*(N) \geq 4$ implies $r^*(N/e_1\backslash e_2) \geq 3$, by (3) and Theorem 2.4 some graph H that is 2-isomorphic to $G/e_1\backslash e_2$ can be extended to a graphic bicircular lift representation of N/e_1, which is not possible, since $C - \{e_1, e_2\}$ is a forest in H, it is no way adding e_2 to H such that $C - e_1$ is a theta-subgraph or a handcuff. □

Next, we prove that $N = L(G)$. To Prove the result, by Claims 2 and 3 it suffices to show that each theta-subgraph T of G containing e_1, e_2 is in $\mathcal{C}(N)$. Note that e_1, e_2 maybe a series pair of $G|T$. Let P be a path internally disjoint with T with its end-vertices on

T. By (4) we can further assume that P is chosen such that there are cycles C_1, C_2 of G with $e_1 \in C_1 \subseteq (T \cup P) - e_2$ and $e_2 \in C_2 \subseteq (T \cup P) - e_1$. Let C be the cycle of G with $C \subseteq (T \cup P) - \{e_1, e_2\}$. Evidently, such C exists and $P \subseteq (C \cup C_1) \cap (C \cup C_2)$. Moreover, since $C \cup C_1, C \cup C_2 \in \mathcal{C}(N)$, for each $f \in P$ there is a set $C' \in \mathcal{C}(N)$ with $C' \subseteq (T \cup P) - e$. Claim 1 implies that $C' = T$. Hence, the lemma holds. □

The following result follows immediately from Lemmas 5.3, 5.6 and 5.7.

Lemma 5.8. *Either $r(M) \leq 11$ or $r(M^*) \leq 4$.*

Lemma 5.9. *When $r(M^*) \leq 4$, we have $r(M) \leq 9$.*

Proof. Evidently, $r(M^*) \geq 2$ for otherwise M is graphic. Let f be an element of M such that N is 3-connected with $U_{2,4}$-minors for some matroid $N \in \{M\backslash f, M/f\}$. Let B be a basis of N and G a graph with $N = L(G)$. Since N is 3-connected, G is 2-edge-connected and has no degree-2 vertices. Moreover, since $2 \leq |E(N) - B| \leq 4$ and $G|B$ is a spanning graph with a unique cycle, the graph $G|B$ has at most four degree-1 vertices and $r(N) = |V(G)| \leq 8$. So $r(M) \leq 9$. □

Elements x and x' of a matroid N are *clones* if the function exchanging x with x' and fixing every other points in $E(N)$ is an automorphism of N. A set $X \subseteq E(N)$ is a *clonal set* of N if every pair of elements of X are clones.

Lemma 5.10. *M has no $U_{2,5}$-restriction.*

Proof. Assume otherwise. Let X be a subset of $E(M)$ with $M|X = U_{2,n}$ and $n \geq 5$. We claim that there is a clonal set $X_1 \subseteq X$ of M with $|X_1| \geq 3$. Let $e \in X$. Since $M\backslash e$ is non-graphic, there is a graph H with $M\backslash e = L(H)$. Let X_1 be the parallel class of H with $X_1 \subset X$. Evidently, $|X_1| \geq 3$ and X_1 is a clonal set of $M\backslash e$ as $M\backslash e = L(H)$. Next we prove that X_1 is also a clonal set of M. Assume otherwise. Then there are $e_1, e_2 \in X_1$ and an independent set I of M with $I \subseteq E(M) - X$ such that $I \cup \{e, e_1\} \in \mathcal{C}(M)$ and $I \cup \{e, e_2\} \notin \mathcal{C}(M)$. Since $\{e, e_1, e_2\} \in \mathcal{C}(M)$, there is a circuit C of M with $e_2 \in C \subseteq I \cup \{e, e_2\}$. Moreover, since X_1 is a clonal set of $M\backslash e$ and $I \cup e_1$ is independent in M, there is a set $I_1 \subseteq I$ with $C = I_1 \cup \{e, e_2\}$. Since $I \cup \{e, e_2\} \notin \mathcal{C}(M)$, we have $I_1 \neq I$. Then there is a circuit C_1 of M with $C_1 \subseteq (C \cup \{e, e_1, e_2\}) - e_2 \subseteq I_1 \cup \{e, e_1\}$, a contradiction to the fact $I \cup \{e, e_1\} \in \mathcal{C}(M)$. So the claim holds.

Let G_1 be a graph with $M\backslash e_1 = L(G_1)$. Since X_1 is a clonal set of M with at least three elements, $G_1|X_1 - e_1$ is a non-trivial parallel class. Add the edge e_1 to G_1 get a graph G such that $G|X_1$ is a parallel class. Since X_1 is a clonal set of M, it is easy to verify that $M = L(G)$, a contradiction. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. When M is not 3-connected, Theorems 3.6 and 4.9 imply that M is direct sum of $U_{2,4}$ and a loop. So we may assume that M is 3-connected. By Lemmas 5.8 and 5.9 we have $r(M) \leq 11$. When $r(M^*) \leq 2$, we have $|E(M)| \leq 13$. So we may assume that $r(M^*) \geq 3$. By Lemma 5.4, there is an element $f \in E(M)$ such that $\mathrm{co}(M\backslash f)$ is 3-connected with $U_{2,4}$-minors. Let G be a graph with $\mathrm{co}(M\backslash f) = L(G)$. Since M has no $U_{2,5}$-restriction by Lemma 5.10, the matroid $\mathrm{co}(M\backslash f)$ also has no $U_{2,5}$-restriction. Hence, $|E(G)| \leq 4 \times \binom{11}{2} = 220$ by $|V(G)| = r(\mathrm{co}(M\backslash f)) \leq r(M) \leq 11$. On the other hand, since $r(\mathrm{co}(M\backslash f)) \geq r(M) - 3$ by Lemma 5.4, we have

$$|E(M)| \leq |E(\mathrm{co}(M\backslash f))| + 4 = |E(G)| + 4 \leq 224.$$

□

REFERENCES

[1] R. E. Bixby, ℓ-matrices and a characterization of non-binary matroids, Discrete Math, 8 (1974) 139-145.
[2] R. Chen, Z. Gao, Representations of bicircular lift matriods, Electr. J. Combin., 23(3) (2016) ♯P3.42.
[3] J. Oxley, Matroid Theory, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2012.
[4] I. Pivotto, http://matroidunion.org/?p=279.
[5] P. Seymour, Decomposition of regular matroids, J. Combin Theory Ser. B, 28 (1980) 305-359.
[6] W. T. Tutte, Matroids and graphs, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc, 90 (1959) 527-552.
[7] H. Whitney, 2-isomorphic graphs. Amer. J. Math, 55 (1933) 245-254.
[8] T. Zaslavsky, Biased graphs. I. Bias, balance and gains. J. Combin Theory Ser. B, 47 (1989), 32-52.
[9] T. Zaslavsky, Biased graphs. II. The three matroids. J. Combin Theory Ser. B, 51 (1991), 46-72.

CENTER FOR DISCRETE MATHEMATICS, FUZHOU UNIVERSITY, FUZHOU, P. R. CHINA.